

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT TACOMA

8 RICHARD ROY SCOTT,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 VAN HOOK,

12 Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:16-CV-05785-RBL-DWC

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RE-  
NOTE

13 The District Court referred this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action to United States Magistrate  
14 Judge David W. Christel. Plaintiff Richard Roy Scott, a civil detainee proceeding *pro se* and *in*  
15 *forma pauperis* (“IFP”), initiated this action on September 6, 2016. *See* Dkt. 1. Currently before  
16 the Court is a document filed by Plaintiff titled “Re-noting Mts DK#s 8 and 10” (“Motion”),  
17 wherein Plaintiff requests the Court re-note two motions which were previously denied by this  
18 Court. Dkt. 30.

19 Plaintiff requests the Court re-note the “Motion for Leave to Conduct Discovery of  
20 Defendant Hook Motion for TRO” (“Motion for Discovery”) and “Motion for Expert Funding  
21 and Special Master or Standby Lawyer” (“Motion for Special Master”) because the motions are  
22 now ripe for review. Dkt. 8, 10, 30. These two motions were ready for the Court’s consideration  
23 in October of 2016. *See* Dkt. 8, 10. On November 15, 2016, the Court denied the motions as  
24

1 premature and in violation of Plaintiff's case management orders. Dkt. 18. The Court declines to  
2 vacate its previous decision and revive the motions simply because Plaintiff asserts the motions  
3 are ripe for review. Accordingly, the Motion is denied.<sup>1</sup> See *Whitney v. Edwards*, 1994 WL  
4 478814, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 1994) (denying plaintiff's request to revive issues decided in  
5 previous orders).

6 Dated this 22nd day of February, 2017.

7 

8 David W. Christel  
9 United States Magistrate Judge  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

---

23  
24 <sup>1</sup> The Court notes nothing in this order prevents Plaintiff from filing new motions regarding his requests for  
discovery and for a special master.